

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of MARIA CHRISTINA RUIZ-  
ZENDEJAS, MARIA GUADALUPE RUIZ-  
ZENDEJAS, JOHN CARLOS RUIZ-ZENDEJAS,  
and MILDRED SARAHY RUIZ-ZENDEJAS,  
Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JUAN RUIZ-FLORES,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JULIA ZENDEJAS,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of MARIA CHRISTINA RUIZ-  
ZENDEJAS, MARIA GUADALUPE RUIZ-  
ZENDEJAS, JOHN CARLOS RUIZ-ZENDEJAS,  
and MILDRED SARAHY RUIZ-ZENDEJAS,  
Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JUAN RUIZ-FLORES,

Respondent,

UNPUBLISHED

June 25, 2009

No. 289571

Oakland Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 04-691925-NA

No. 289572

Oakland Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 04-691925-NA

and

JULIA ZENDEJAS,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

Before: Owens, P.J., and Servitto and Gleicher, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from a circuit court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i) and (ii), and (j). We affirm. These appeals have been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to both respondents. MCR 3.977(E); *In re Utrera*, 281 Mich App 1, 16-17; 761 NW2d 253 (2008). The three older children became temporary court wards due to suspected child abuse. Maria Guadalupe was treated for various injuries that were inconsistent with respondent Zendejas's explanations. She was discovered to have multiple broken bones in various stages of healing that had apparently gone untreated. After participating in services, respondents were deemed rehabilitated and the children were returned to their care. The following year, John was treated for a segmental fracture of the femur, and Zendejas's explanation for the injury, although possible, was not likely. Additional investigation revealed that the child had sustained a broken clavicle four to six months earlier, which went untreated despite evidence that the child would have been in severe pain.

Further, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Donald S. Owens  
/s/ Deborah A. Servitto  
/s/ Elizabeth L. Gleicher